

MARCIN JAROSZEK
Jagiellonian University in Krakow
marcin.jaroszek@uj.edu.pl

L1 VS L2 SPOKEN MODALITY USE – RESULTS OF A STUDY

Keywords: modality, language transfer, contrastive analysis, foreign language learning

Abstract

The article discusses the results of a study of how modality, as an aspect of spoken discourse competence in thirteen selected advanced students of English, was realised when Polish is the mother tongue and English the foreign language. Since the subjects demonstrated high levels of language proficiency, a portrait of an advanced learner of English is described in the first section of the article. Section 2 of the article presents the research questions and data collection procedures. The results of the study are interpreted in Section 3, in which an attempt is made to investigate possible correlations between L1 and L2 modality use with reference to deontic and epistemic modality, in a quantitative and qualitative form.

1. Introduction

Advanced learners of English without doubt demonstrate high levels of communicative competence, including the ability to adjust their L2 output to specific communicative contexts, applying the appropriate register of language production and constructing coherent stretches of speech. Yet they may still have difficulties in constructing speech that expresses the intended message through the use of discourse particles that reflect the authentic, conventional structure of spoken output. These include, for instance, modality, which is generally understood as communicating the speaker's stance on a communicated message.

The empirical part of this article discusses the results of a study on how thirteen advanced learners of English realised modality in similar communicative contexts when Polish is the mother tongue and English the foreign language. The research

was conducted with the understanding that the dynamics of discourse competence development as well as discourse making itself is likely to be contingent upon the first language of the learner and their L1 conception of the world, as well as upon discourse constructed in a foreign language classroom. It was also borne in mind as well that the speakers' language proficiency can also affect these processes. As it is advanced L2 learners, whose L1 and L2 modality use are investigated in this article, the following section provides a description of such an individual. After characteristics of a proficient learner are discussed in section 2 and the data collection procedures stipulated in Section 3, the results of the study are presented and interpreted in Section 4 of the article.

2. Modality and an advanced foreign language learner

The term "advanced" suggests that the user's language proficiency is an excellent standard which enables them to communicate not only fluently but with due linguistic and sociolinguistic precision in any L2 encounter. Yet, there is a question as to how the term "advance" relates to native-like proficiency, where this proficiency actually begins and what language domains it covers. As claimed by Odlin (2008: 306) "in decades of intensive SLA research (from the mid-1960s to the present), many linguists have pondered just how far learners of a second language may attain the competence and performance capacities of native speakers, and the question remains controversial." The Critical Period Hypothesis, for example, posits that native-like attainment is not possible if L2 learning is postponed past a critical age of the acquirer (Birdsong 2005: 89).

A proficient non-native speaker of English is then expected to, at least imprecisely, replicate the speaking conventions utilised by native speakers of English. Such a speaker "has a unique capacity to produce fluent spontaneous discourse, which exhibits pauses mainly at clause boundaries [the 'one clause at a time' facility] (...) and exhibits a wide range of communicative competence" (Davies 2003: 210). Krashen (1982) maintains that native-like, predominantly subconscious language use is characteristic of those learners who have internalised it in a naturalistic way, that is through comprehensible input with little emphasis on peripheral grammar. Although this approach has been challenged many times, e.g. by McLaughlin (1987), who asserts that conscious learning can indeed lead to subconscious use of language through the process of automatising, a question remains as to whether the product itself can, in fact, be fully independent of the process. McLaughlin and other advocates of the Strong Interface Position claim that it can, maintaining that a learner is, in fact, capable of automatically processing language forms even if they have been internalised consciously. But even if this hypothesis is to be accepted, another controversial question arises, that is whether "automatic" and "subconscious" are part of the same equation.

Thus whether the learning outcome is subconscious or automatic requires further examination. Notwithstanding the difficulties in determining its nature, many attempts continue to be made to establish transparent requirements in order to classify a learner as an advanced language user. In a recent compilation by the Council of Europe (2003),

a precise classification of foreign language users is proposed. Since the object of this study is to analyse the development of discourse competence in spoken language, the following discussion will refer to an advanced learner’s oral proficiency.

Common reference levels are divided in three groups (A, B, C). The proficient user can demonstrate language proficiency at two levels, that is C1, representing Effective Operational Proficiency and C2, representing Comprehensive Operational Proficiency. Table 1 lists the requirements for proficient English learners.

Level group	Level	Description
Proficient user	C2	Can understand with ease virtually everything heard. Can summarise information from different spoken sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning, even in more complex situations. Can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. If faced with a problem, he/she can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it. Can present a clear, smoothly flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points.
	C1	Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed texts on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices. Can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate his/her contribution skillfully to those of other speakers. Can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.

Table 1. Common Reference Level scale. Adapted from the Council of Europe (2003: 24–27)

Table 1 shows that it might be difficult, if not impossible, to determine language proficiency at a specific level. The scale is rife with generalisations, such as “appropriate,” “good” or “spontaneous,” which allows an infinite number of interpretations on the part of the assessor. What is positive is that it is not only grammar competence, fluency or accuracy, that have been specified as determinants of the speaker’s proficiency, but also the ability to successfully construct discourse, although no direct reference is made to discourse mechanisms other than connectives and cohesive devices.

However, although advanced students, for instance, at university level, predominantly show pragmatic awareness in language production (Krawczyk-Nejfar 2004: 45), it would be naïve and unrealistic to expect a proficient learner to construct authentic discourse in each and every communicative event. Still, a frequent and appropriate use of, for example, modality devices will indicate native-like attainment, as will a natural diversity in the use of discourse mechanisms, suitably tailored to a specific situational context of communication.

An analysis of a proficient language learner can also be undertaken through an investigation into their learning routines, learning experience and attitudes. Certainly, advanced learners do have a remarkable amount of learning experience, whether in formal educational or naturalistic settings, which undoubtedly should be helpful in overcoming their learning and communication difficulties. It would be hoped that they have dispensed with the constraints of the monitor to be able to enjoy a considerable degree of the liberating, rather than restricting, force of communication. They should, after hours spent on their academic endeavours, have developed into independent learners, being able to utilise, at their level of proficiency, their learning experience, as realised in learning autonomy. This is the theory, however, it is not what is seen in practice.

The subjects selected to be investigated in this research, however, are not standard proficient learners of English. They are third-year students at an English language teacher training college and therefore would be expected to have greater autonomy, possibly due to the teacher training they receive in classes. Such advanced learners, as indicated by Wysocka (1999: 274), “demonstrate an analytic attitude toward language material greater than the average, develop a high degree of autonomy and are able to maintain and control their learning.” Thus the professional education the advanced learners of English under investigation receive influences their individual learning, and possibly communicative choices.

3. Method

The study, which is presented in this section, is aimed at analysing the modality use of thirteen advanced learners of English as a foreign language. The subjects are those described in my previous articles (e.g. Jaroszek 2011a, b), yet for the sake of clarity, some basic information regarding the participants as well as the procedures used will be considered below.

3.1. Research focus and research questions

The objective of the study is to investigate how thirteen advanced students of English as a Foreign Language realised modality in their native tongue as well as in their target language. The area of investigation was narrowed down to spoken production only. The main research question is then:

- Is there a correlation between modality use in the participants' L₁ and L₂?

Specifically, the research questions are as follows:

- Does the use of modality in the participants' L1 affect their use of modality in L2?
- Does the use of modality in the participants' L2 affect their use of modality in L1?
- What modality devices in the participants' L1 and L2 are correlated?

3.2. Subjects

The subjects are thirteen students of English at an English language teacher training college in the final, that is third year of their tertiary education. All the selected students agreed to participate in the study, were made aware of the commitment required and were instructed on the procedure of data collection. They were, however, not informed as to the objective of the research, since this could have affected their language performance and, consequently, would have distorted the results of the analysis.

3.3. Research instruments

The development of the subjects' L2 modality was measured on the basis of spoken performance samples recorded in May 2007. The subjects took part in two approximately ten-minute discussions in groups of three. One discussion was designed to trigger the subjects' informal output, the other their formal one. The samples were tapescribed and examined for the use of modality devices. In an effort to verify possible L1 transfer in the use of the subjects' discourse devices, student interviews were conducted in Polish. Their form was similar to that of the English interviews.

3.4. Statistical calculations

Since most of the data will be presented numerically, to reflect the actual modality intensity levels the following intensity ratio was calculated:

$$MIR = \frac{n}{L}$$

where

- *MIR* represents the modality intensity ratio
- *n* represents the number of occurrences found
- and *L* represents the length of language output, as realised in transcribed text signs.

The ratio calculation helps sustain the proportions of speech stretches and the number of devices used. The length of speech, therefore, had no effect on the calculation of modality intensity.

It should also be noted that thirteen students is a low statistical sample and is nowhere near representative of the whole population. The study could, therefore, be treated either as thirteen case studies, with the focus on the participants' individual modality uses, or as one case study, when the participants are considered as a whole group.

4. Results

This section presents and interprets the results of the study of the participants’ modality use in their L1 and L2. In the first part of this section, a quantitative analysis is undertaken in an effort to discern possible modal phenomena characteristic of the whole group of 13 subjects. Later, in section 4.2, the results are interpreted with reference to the actual use of specific modality devices in the participants’ mother tongue and the target language.

4.1. Quantitative analysis

The following quantitative analysis discusses the use of L1 and L2 modality by the thirteen subjects with reference to two modality types: epistemic and deontic modalities. As an analysis of the individual use of modality was often inconclusive, statistical calculations applied to the modality use of the whole group of thirteen participants in the study. Such an approach is acceptable, though one should not generalise the results of the statistical calculation to a larger population, since thirteen subjects is not a representative statistical sample.

The results of the correlational analysis of L1 vs L2 modality use are problematic. An attempt to correlate the students’ deontic L1 with their deontic L2 modality use intensity levels, as well as the students’ epistemic L1 with their epistemic L2 modality use intensity levels is in most cases inconclusive. As illustrated in the correlation table (see Table 2), the only significant correlation was found between final deontic modality and final epistemic modality (0.5704, with $p=,042$).

	L1 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	L1 DEONTIC MODALITY	L2 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	L2 DEONTIC MODALITY
L1 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	1	0.2301	−0.1844	−0.0957
	p= ---	p=,450	p=,547	p=,756
L1 DEONTIC MODALITY	0.2301	1	−0.0883	−0.1442
	p=,450	p= ---	p=,774	p=,638
L2 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	−0.1844	−0.0883	1	0.5704
	p=,547	p=,774	p= ---	p=,042
L2 DEONTIC MODALITY	−0.0957	−0.1442	0.5704	1
	p=,756	p=,638	p=,042	p= ---

Table 2. Students’ L1 vs L2 correlation

These findings could indicate that those who modalised their discourse to clarify their stance on the reliability of the conveyed information also showed a more deontic expectation towards the issues discussed in their discourse construction. It could also be said that those who show less deontic expectation in their discourse tend to take a more restrained stance with regard to the validity of the conveyed information.

There is definite evidence, however, that L1 deontic modality can be linked to L2 deontic modality. Table 2 shows no significant correlation between the two, the analysis indicates that in five cases the reliability area is exceeded and thus a possible correlation is distorted. After rejecting S6, S7, S10, S11 and S13, a significant correlation of 0.8139 with $p=0.014$ between L1 deontic modality and L2 deontic modality was found (see Table 3). As for epistemic modality, the results were vague and no significant correlation was found.

	L1 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	L1 DEONTIC MODALITY	L2 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	L2 DEONTIC MODALITY
L1 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	1	-0.0533	-0.1234	0.0631
	p= ---	p=,900	p=,771	p=,882
L1 DEONTIC MODALITY	-0.0533	1	0.2272	0.8139
	p=,900	p= ---	p=,589	p=,014
L2 EPISTEMIC MODALITY	-0.1234	0.2272	1	0.5742
	p=,771	p=,589	p= ---	p=,137
L2 DEONTIC MODALITY	0.0631	0.8139	0.5742	1
	p=,882	p=,014	p=,137	p= ---

Table 3. Students' L1 vs L2 correlation with S6, S7, S10 S11 and S13 rejected

It could be concluded from this discussion that it is not the intensity of the use of modality devices that distinguishes L1 modality use from L2 modality use. I have already shown (Jaroszek 2011a) that the participants' L2 modality use levels deviated slightly from a native reference model. This somewhat surprising finding challenges a common belief that Polish native speakers modalise their speech far less frequently in the Polish language than native speakers of English do in their L1. In fact, as illustrated in Table 4, Polish discourse may be more epistemically and deontically modalised, which supports the above finding. It seems that it is indeed not so much the modality intensity levels in the subjects' speech that make a difference as the diversity and distribution of modality devices throughout their discourse.

Modality system	L2 MODALITY			L1 MODALITY		
	L2 overall	deontic modality	episthemic modality	L1 overall	deontic modality	episthemic modality
S1	0.003170577	0.002041096	0.002817656	0.01361634	0.004004806	0.009611534
S2	0.010443	0.002544	0.004631	0.009041	0.00452	0.00452
S3	0.0104172	0.0043989	0.0042615	0.0097002	0.0059524	0.0037478
S4	0.004943123	0.001434688	0.00486281	0.006104329	0.003884573	0.002219756
S5	0.010458	0.002722	0.005093	0.010659	0.004568	0.006091
S6	0.015226	0.004346	0.007433	0.007234	0.00296	0.004275
S7	0.009944	0.001905	0.00515	0.013263	0.008252	0.00501
S8	0.016735	0.004641	0.007878	0.010827	0.004812	0.006015
S9	0.007753	0.003572	0.004194	0.009908	0.005808	0.0041
S10	0.00889	0.00228	0.00445	0.01523	0.00728	0.00795
S11	0.003767	0.003572	0.004194	0.013621	0.007946	0.005675
S12	0.013450697	0.004537205	0.006049607	0.013518887	0.006759443	0.006759443
S13	0.004927	0.002678	0.004568	0.012914	0.007514	0.0054
TOTAL		0.003128598	0.005044904		0.005712703	0.00549017

Table 4. Students’ L1 vs L2 intensity levels

Table 5 clearly shows that with one exception (S4) modality diversity levels in L1 were significantly higher than in L2. L1, therefore, apparently did not play a debilitating role in the students’ L2 performance with respect to the diversity of modality devices. This is confirmed by the statistical analysis, which indicates that the correlation between the students’ L1 modality diversity and their L2 modality diversity is 0.052 with $p=0.865$. This result suggests that the students’ L2 modality diversity may remain independent from any L1 influence.

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7
L1	0.360216	0.313756	0.400892	0.212014	0.409722	0.308277	0.412021
L2	0.212494	0.220108	0.192982	0.186453	0.213909	0.206027	0.162932

	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	Average
L1	0.450897	0.392098	0.514685	0.303218	0.358925	0.3984	0.371932
L2	0.209727	0.172968	0.188507	0.212083	0.198344	0.179765	0.196638

Table 5. Students’ Polish modality diversity vs English modality diversity

The finding that the students’ average overall L1 modality diversity rate (0.371932) was higher than the students’ average overall L2 modality diversity rate (0.196638) appears to support the above claim that it is the diversity of modality device use rather than the intensity of modality use that determines the authenticity of speech. The participants might have had trouble using the English equivalents of *niby, przecież, chyba, podobno, ponoć*, and might have, consequently, had a limited repertoire of modality devices. The type and the actual number of modality devices, however, require a more qualitative analysis, which is presented in the next section of the article.

4.2. Qualitative analysis

An analysis of the possible correlations between the use of specific L1 and L2 modality devices in individual subjects proved to be rather inconclusive. On average each subject was found to modalise their speech 29 times in Polish and 23 in English, using as many as 87 different L1 devices and 86 L2 devices. Yet the distribution of the use of specific devices was far from even and, consequently, highlighted that whereas some were used frequently, others were used sporadically only by individual speakers. The devices used once by individual speakers were *rzeczywiście, mniej więcej, tak naprawdę* by S9 (as compared with the single use of the English *maybe, I don’t know, probably, can, of course, have to, quite*), *niestety, nie da się, nie do pomyślenia, szczególnie* by S3 (as compared with the English *will, have to, I would say, honestly, I would risk, at all*), *cholernie, zdaje się* by S7 (*supposed, should, in my opinion, really, allowed, could*), or *w jakimś sensie, w zasadzie* by S8 (*I don’t know, may, could*). Since little correlation was found between the L1 and L2 modality devices that were peripheral phenomena in individual subjects’ speech, it seemed more reasonable to attempt to determine possible correlations between devices that took a central position in the subjects’ discourse (see Table 6).

	L1	L2	POSSIBLE TRANSFER
S1	myślę (6), może (5), mógłby 4),	really (5), think (3), I don’t know (2)	THINK
S2	jakoś/jakiś (3), przecież (3), nie wiem (2), powiedzmy (2)	think (5), should (4), in fact (4), would (4), I don’t know (3), let’s say (2)	I DON’T KNOW, LET’S SAY

	L1	L2	POSSIBLE TRANSFER
S3	może (6), musi (4), wcale / w ogóle (3)	think (4), can (4), should (4), really (4), probably (2), would (2)	----
S4	po prostu (2)	can (7), will (5), I don't know (2)	-----
S5	wiem (3), jakoś/jakiś (2), nie wiem (2)	can (4), will (3), I don't know (2), possible (2),	I DON'T KNOW
S6	nie wiem (3), na pewno (2), ogólnie (2), tak (2)	think (6), should (6), may- be (5), can (4), may (3)	-----
S7	nie wiem (5), generalnie (5), na- prawdę (4), jakoś/jakiś (4)	think (6), maybe (4), can (3), have to (3), I don't know (2)	I DON'T KNOW
S8	słyszałam (3), musi (3), nie wiem (3)	should (10), think (7), actu- ally (5), I don't know (4), I'm sure (3), somehow (3), let's say (3), maybe (2), would (2)	I DON'T KNOW
S9	po prostu (6), tak (6), na pewno (5), myślę (3), zapewne (3),	think (7), will (2), should (2), may (2), in a way (2), could (2)	I THINK,
S10	myślę (2), wydaje mi się (2), tryb przypuszczający (2),	think (7), may (4), should (3), maybe (2), can (2)	I THINK,
S11	nie wiem (2), ma (2), oczywi- ście (2)	can (5), think (2), of course (2), I don't know (2), definitely (2)	I DON'T KNOW, OF COURSE
S12	powinien (6), może (4), nie wiem(3)	should (10), will (7), can (4), think (3), maybe (3), would (3), really (2)	SHOULD, CAN
S13	nie wiem (9), jakiś/jakoś (4), może (4)	can (4), should (3), will (3), re- ally (3), may (2), maybe (2)	MAYBE

Table 6. Students' use of L1 vs L2 modality devices

As illustrated in Table 6, no correlation between L1 and L2 modality use was found in S3, S4 and S6, and some correlation between L1 and L2 modality use was found in the remaining subjects, although this was mostly in the use of the epistemic *I think* (S1, S9, S10) and *I don't know* (S2, S5, S7, S8, S11), which could be classified as a popular hedge. Other possible correlations included *let's say*, as found in S2, *of course*, as observed in S11, *should* or *can* in S12 and *maybe* in S13. This analysis does indicate that in certain cases, some modality devices may have in fact been used in both languages as a result of discourse transfer, either from L1 to L2 or L2 to L1. Yet the results clearly show that the majority of devices found in the subjects' discourse were used only once, and it seems these devices had become integrated into the subject's language system as a result of factors other than language transfer, for instance, interlanguage development, naturally affected by language input or teaching procedures. This is more clearly illustrated in an analysis of the specific modality devices used by the whole group of thirteen subjects.

L1 MODALITY		L2 MODALITY					
Least frequently used devices		Least frequently used devices (up to 0.29)					
device	Use frequency						
rzeczywiście	0.170823	to be to	sadly	deeply certainly	at all		
		that's my	entirely ought to	that	generally		
mniej więcej	0.170823	opinion	fully	I suppose	in my		
tak naprawdę	0.170823	indeed	simply	honestly	opinion		
		appear	I understand	do/does	able to		
niestety	0.220459	my opinion is	likely	perhaps	possible		
nie da się	0.220459	I would risk	as for me	I'm afraid			
		I stand	presume	as far as I know			
nie do pomyslenia	0.220459	totally	basically	need			
szczególnie	0.220459	extremely	admit	obvious			
		I'm in favor of	kind of	Got to			
wiadomo	0.234797	pretty	a bit	completely			
wierzę	0.234797	possibly	for sure	I would say			
		unfortunately	I must say	I know			
ponoć	0.234797	rather	seem	against/for			
cholernie	0.294724	I'm certain	in a way	allowed			
		consider	modal + have	let's say			
zdaje się (seem)	0.294724	no way	the fact is	quite			

Most frequently used devices		Most frequently used devices	
device	Use frequency	device	Use frequency
generalnie	4.116696	would	1.782062
może	4.421057	may	2.065262
ma/miał (supposed)	4.533506	have to	2.318022
po prostu	5.1556	really	3.057719
musieć	5.169112	I don't know	3.063886
myślę	5.550268	maybe	4.576638
chyba	6.069531	will	5.316934
jakoś/jakiś	7.212523	should	5.568023
powinien	7.498071	can	7.627394
nie wiem	12.70416	think	9.910794

Table 7. Specific distribution of modality devices

As illustrated in Table 7, not only was L1 modality realised with through use of different devices than those used in L2 modality, but also the specific distribution of these devices was jarringly different. In L1 modality the frequency peripheries (up to 0.29) were occupied by twelve devices, whereas in L2 modality by as many as 61 devices. At the same time, the 10 most frequently used modality devices were found within comparable spreads of 8.5 in L1 discourse and 8.2 in L2 discourse. What differed with regard to the most frequently used modality devices, however, were the actual values of the frequency levels, which in the case of L1 were between 4.3 and 12.7, whereas in L2 they were considerably lower, that is between 1.7 and 9.9.

This finding might indicate that the subjects' L2 modality was realised in an irregular, perhaps even accidental manner, since the observed L2 devices were more scattered across the frequency-of-use scale. In addition, the results clearly show that the most used ten L2 devices were eight verbs and just two adverbs (*really, maybe*), whereas the most used ten L1 modality devices were five verbs and five adverbs or adverbials, which suggests the subjects' L2 modality realisation might have been inauthentic, possibly as a result of inadequate teaching procedures that appear to fail to focus L2 learners' attention on authentic ways of modalising speech. Consequently, many learners' modality realisation repertoire is perhaps rather optimistically left to self-adjust, which may eventually lead to inadequate discourse construction, even in the case of advanced students.

5. Conclusions

This article investigates to what extent L2 spoken modality use correlates with L1 modality use in thirteen advanced learners of English. The results indicate that there is a strong correlation between L1 deontic modality and L2 deontic modality, although no significant correlations were found in the other cases of modality use. An interesting observation was made with reference to modality diversity. The results show that L1 modality diversity levels are significantly higher than those in L2, which indicates that it is not so much the intensity of speech modalisation, but the diversity of specific modality devices that determines the authenticity of speech. In this respect L2 modality showed a marked deficiency. This finding, together with the correlation analysis of modality diversity, suggests the students' L2 modality diversity was independent from any L1 influence.

The qualitative analysis finds the strongest correlation between the use of modality in L1 and L2 with reference to the use of the epistemic *I think* and *I don't know*, though the latter could have been used as a standard gap-filling device. A potential transfer of modal devices was observed in relation to the modality devices *should*, *maybe*, *let's say* and *of course* in the language production of individual participants. The results indicate that since the majority of the devices found in the subjects' discourse were used just once by individual students, these devices had become part of their modal repertoire as a result of factors other than language transfer, such as language input or teaching procedures.

The results also suggest that the subjects' modality realisation might have been inauthentic. It was observed that the most used ten L1 modality devices included five verbs and five adverbs, as contrasted with eight verbs and just two adverbs in L2 modality (*really*, *maybe*). This finding indicates that teaching practices may in fact fail to instruct students on authentic ways of modalising speech, even at advanced levels. Further research should certainly examine this possibility, and if this is the case, studies should be undertaken to investigate the possible reasons why teachers might choose to refrain from instructing their students on the appropriate realisation of this aspect of discourse.

References

- Birdsong D. 2005. Second language acquisition and ultimate attainment. – Davies A., Elder C. (eds.). *The handbook of applied linguistics*. London: 82–105.
- Council of Europe. 2003. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge.
- Davies A. 2003. *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. London.
- Jaroszek M. 2011a. Factors determining the development of modality in advanced L2 speech – a longitudinal study. – *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 128: 23–52.
- Jaroszek M. 2011b. Development of conjunction use in advanced L2 speech. – *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 1: 533–553.
- Krashen S. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford.

- Krawczyk-Nejfar E. 2004. The role of proficiency factor in the development of pragmatic awareness among Polish learners of English. – Arabski J. (ed.). *Pragmatics and language learning*. Kraków: 37–50.
- McLaughlin B. 1987. *Theories of second-language learning*. London.
- Odlin T. 2008. Conceptual transfer and meaning extensions. – Robinson P., Ellis N.C. (eds.). *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: 306–340.
- Wysocka M. 1999. FL teachers as FL learners and FL users. – Wysocka M. (ed.). *On language theory and practice*. [vol 2]. Katowice: 269–275.